

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the official action of September 30, 2005.

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity and to omit reference to ruthenium metal, and claim 2 has correspondingly been canceled. Claim 4 has been amended for clarity.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being disclosed by Johnston et al (U.S. 2004/0084773 A1). Reconsideration is requested.

Referring to amended claim 1, the titanium metal is attached to the copper metal line. However, Johnston cites only the ruthenium metal as a metal attached to the copper metal line. Johnston does not teach or suggest that titanium metal is attached to the copper metal line.

Accordingly, the applicant believes that the claim 1 is distinguishable from Johnston and other claims depending on the base claim 1 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston. However, claim 5 depends on the claim 1. Therefore, applicant believes that the claim 5 is in condition for allowance, since claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, he is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

December 23, 2005

By: 

James P. Zeller

Reg. No. 28,491

Attorneys for Applicants

6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300